



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,832	11/01/2001	Leslie G. Polgar	83241/THC	6290

7590

11/02/2005

Thomas H. Close
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

DINH, DUC Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/003,832	Applicant(s) POLGAR ET AL.	
	Examiner DUC Q. DINH	Art Unit 2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on July 29, 2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehme et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,512,670) in view of Wu (US 2002/0193141) and further in view of Kotchick et al. (U.S Patent No 6,642,977).

In reference to claim 1, Boehme discloses an disaggregated flat-panel color display in Fig. 13, comprising: a frame (housing of display screen 42, col. 3, lines 50-52), a display screen (42) mounted in the frame; and an electrical/mechanical interface on the frame for releasably attaching the frame to one of a plurality of different electronic devices (col. 3, lines 20-25).

Boemeh does not disclose a power supply and memory to maintain an image on the display when detached from the electronic display. However, Wu discloses a display device use for a camera having its own power supply (charge battery 210) and memory (27) to maintain an image on the display when detached from the electronic device 21 (See Fig. 1, 4 and paragraph [0019] of Wu).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the battery and the memory in the display device of Boehme to view the information (i.e. pictures of the taken camera images) in view of the teaching of Wu because it would provide an display device that users can retrieve information even when the display device is detached from the specific electronic device (paragraph [0007] of Wu).

Boehme and Wu discloses an LCD display is used for the system but do not disclose the display is an OLED display. Kotchick discloses an electronic device having a removable display that can replace with an OLED display device (Fig. 8, col. 17, lines 39-45).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the liquid crystal display device in the combination of Boehme and Wu with the OLED display as taught by Kotchick because it would provide an electronic device that can have interchangeable display modules thereby allowing for different display appearances and/or functionalities as users' desires (col. 1, lines 53-56 of Kotchick).

In reference to claim 2, refer to the rejection as applied to claim 1 for the details of the flat panel color display. Furthermore, Boehme discloses a plurality of electronic devices (computer 12, Fig. 1, camcorder Fig. 14, DVD player 49, Fig. 16), each having an electrical/mechanical interface to connect to the electrical/mechanical interface of the display device 42 (col. 5, lines 35-65).

In reference to claim 3, Wu discloses the electrical/mechanical interface is compatible with the digital video interface (interface use with the digital camera 21; [0007]).

In reference to claim 4, Boehme disclose the flat-panel color display claimed in claim 2, display is mechanically mounted on an electronic device to make an apparently single component (See Fig. 13-16).

In reference to claim 5 Boehme discloses the flat-panel color display is mechanically attached to an electronic device through a cable with wires (See Fig. 9).

In reference to claim 6, Boehme discloses the electronic devices includes potable computer (Fig. 1) and Wu discloses (in Fig. 2) the digital camera 21 as claimed.

In reference to claim 9, Kotchick discloses the display panel comprising a touch screen over the OLED display for providing interactive user interface (col. 17, 34-37).

In reference to claims 10 and 18, see the rejection as applied to claim 1 for memory and power supply. In reference to claim addition, Wu disclose a controller with software to provide image review services on the display [0014].

In reference to claim 12 Kotchick discloses the touch screen of the display is adapted to control the electronic device when the display device is attached to the electronic device (col. 17, lines 34-37).

In reference to claim 13, Boehme discloses the electrical interface includes a power interface (col. 4, lines 30-35).

In reference to claims 14-16, Wu discloses a charge circuit connects with the interface circuit to the rechargeable battery in Fig. 4.

4. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehme et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,512,670) in view of Wu (US 2002/0193141) and Kotchick et al. (U.S Patent No 6,642,977) as applied to claims 1-6, 9-10,12-16 and 18 and further in view of Harris et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,009,336).

In reference to claim 7, Boehme discloses the communication between the electronic device and the display can be wireless (col. 3, lines 43-45) but the combination of Boehme, Wu and Kotchick do not discloses a display including a wireless communication transceiver for communicating with the electronic device. Harris discloses a wireless transceiver 122 between electronic devices 110 and 120 as claimed (Fig 1, col. 3, lines 10-24).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the wireless transceiver (122) in the combination of Boehme, Wu and Kotchick in view of the teaching of Harris because it would provide a detachable display device that can remotely communicate with the electronic device thereby the electronic device can be separately positioned as desired by user (col. 2, lines 50-54 of Harris)

In reference to claim 11, Harris discloses the wireless communication interface for communicating control instructions to the electronic device (col. 5, lines 45-59).

Art Unit: 2674

5. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al. (US 20030071791) in view of Kotchick et al (U.S Patent No. 6,642,977).

In reference to claim 1, Hanson discloses an disaggregated flat-panel color display in Fig. 2, comprising: a frame (housing 106), a display screen (170) mounted in the frame; and an electrical/mechanical interface (interface housing 150) on the frame for releasably attaching the frame to any one of a plurality of different electronic devices in Fig. 1 and 5 (paragraph [0044]); power supply and memory to maintain an image on the display when detached from the electronic device 21 (See (paragraph [0029])).

Hanson does not teach the display is an OLED display. Kotchick discloses an electronic device having a removable display that can replace with an OLED display device (Fig. 8, col. 17, lines 39-45).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the OLED display as taught by Kotchick in the system of Hanson because it would provide an electronic device that can have interchangeable display modules to allow for different display appearances and/or functionalities (col. 1, lines 53-56 of Kotchick).

In reference to claim 2, refer to the rejection as applied to claim 1 for the detail of the display device. In addition, Hanson discloses plurality of different electronic devices having an electrical/mechanical interface for attaching with the electrical/mechanical interface of the display (paragraph [0038 and 0044]).

In reference to claim 3, Hanson discloses the electrical/mechanical interface is compatible with the digital video interface (secure digital interface [0037]).

Art Unit: 2674

In reference to claim 4, Hanson disclose the flat-panel color display claimed in claim 2, display is mechanically mounted on an electronic device (mobile phone) to make an apparently single component (see Fig. 5).

In reference to claim 5, Hanson discloses the flat-panel color display is mechanically attached to an electronic device through a cable with wires is used as conventional (paragraph {0005}).

In reference to claim 6, Hanson discloses the electronic devices includes potable computer (Fig. 1) and the digital camera as claimed (paragraph [0045]).

In reference to claim 7, Hanson discloses the interface is a radio frequency communication interface for communicating with the electronic device (paragraph [0028]).

In reference to claim 9, Hanson discloses a touch screen is provided on the display device for providing an interactive user interface (paragraph [0043]).

In reference to claim 10, Hanson discloses the display the display comprising a power, a memory and a controller with software to provide image review services on the display (remote viewing camera (paragraph [0045]).

In reference to claim 11, Hanson discloses the wireless communication interface for communication control instructions to the electronic device (paragraph [0045]).

In reference to claim 12, Hanson discloses the display is adapted to cover the control on the electronic device when the display is attached to the electronic device (paragraph [0043]).

In reference to claim 13, Hanson discloses the electrical interface include power interface (paragraph [0042])

Art Unit: 2674

In reference to claim 15, Hanson discloses the battery for the display device (paragraph [0029]).

In reference to claim 18, Hanson discloses the display comprising having software to provide display service for image stored in the electronic device (paragraph {0044-0045}).

6. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson and Kotchik as applied to claims 1-7, 9-13, 15 and 18 above and further in view of Wu (US 2002/0193141).

In reference to claims 14 and 16 the combination of Hanson and Kotchick do not disclose the display power supply is recharged from a power in the electronic device and the battery is a rechargeable battery. Wu discloses an display device for a digital camera using a rechargeable battery and the battery is recharged from a power supply in the electronic device 21 as claimed (paragraph [0015] of Wu).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the display power supply recharged from the electronic device and the rechargeable battery in the combination of Hanson and Kotchick in view of the teaching of Wu because it would provide consumers a convenient power supply source for the display device when using the display separately from the electronic device, thereby reducing the cost using the system.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on July 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

Art Unit: 2674

references, with respect to the independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3, 9-11, 13-16 (page 5 of the Argument), and independent claim 2 and dependent claims 4-6 (page 6 of the Argument) the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Boehme discloses a display device that can be used with different electronic devices, i.e. portable video device such as camera, camcorder, DVD player and computer system as shown in Fig. 1-16, Wu discloses a display device for a digital camera, camcorder [0006], Kotchick discloses a replaceable OLED display device that can use with different electronic device. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide memory and power in the display of Boehme in view of Wu and replace the display device with the OLED as taught by Kotchik as the reason elaborated in this Office Action. With respect to claim 7 and 12 see the new ground of rejection above.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DUC Q DINH whose telephone number is (571) 272-7686. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edouard Patrick can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2674

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DUC Q DINH
Examiner
Art Unit 2674



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DQD
October 26, 2005